DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 171 EA 030 479

AUTHOR Greenfield, William D., Jr.
TITLE Moral Leadership in Schools: Fact or Fancy?
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethics; Individual Development; *Leadership; Leadership Qualities; Leadership Styles; *Leadership Training; *Moral Development; *Professional Development; Public Schools

ABSTRACT

This essay discusses contributions to the understanding of the concept of "moral leadership" and makes suggestions about the direction inquiry might take in the future. A general introduction is followed by scholars' concerns regarding leadership circa 1979. A selective summary of the key ideas and foci follows of what the writer believes are among the more helpful theoretical contributions and the more useful empirical contributions related to the "moral leadership" concept. The essay concludes with recommendations for study and theory development. Extensive excerpts from original works are included to help the writer more adequately express the complexities and nuances of the "moral leadership" concept. The studies discussed in this essay offer empirical evidence of the importance of the personal and the cultural dimensions of leading in schools, and the interrelatedness of administrators' values and beliefs, language and action, and managing and leading behaviors. An important lesson of research guided by the "moral leadership" concept is that it is possible to study such phenomena empirically, and that the results of such studies can add meaningfully to the field's knowledge base. (Contains 157 references.) (DFR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. Greenfield
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Moral Leadership in Schools: Fact or Fancy?[1]

William D. Greenfield Jr.
Portland State University

ED 443 171

Introduction

The purpose in this essay is not to offer a complete review of the literature. Rather, it is to discuss contributions to understanding the concept of *moral leadership* and to offer suggestions regarding what directions inquiry might take in the future. Toward this purpose, the essay is organized in the following manner. A general introduction is followed by an brief glimpse of scholars'concerns regarding leadership circa 1979, the approximate beginning point for the focus of this essay. What follows is a selective summary of the key ideas and foci of what the writer believes are among the more helpful theoretical contributions and the more useful empirical contributions related to the *moral leadership* concept. The essay concludes with recommendations for study and theory development. Extensive excerpts from original works are included to help the writer more adequately express the complexities and nuances of the *moral leadership* concept.

A little over three decades ago Gross and Herriott (1965) published a large-scale study of leadership in public schools. Directed at understanding the efficacy of the idea of *staff leadership*, Gross and Herriott's finding that the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) of school principals was positively related to "staff morale, the professional performance of teachers, and the pupils' learning", (p. 150) marked the beginning of the field's long-term fascination with understanding school leadership. This early study was rooted in a controversy regarding the proper role of the school administrator: to provide routine administrative support versus to try to influence teachers' performance. The latter orientation, referred to by the researchers as *staff leadership*, provides the conceptual foundation for most of the studies of school leadership since that time. Indeed, it is doubtful that there is any prescriptive, empirical, or theoretical writing since their 1965 study was published that is not grounded, explicitly or implicitly, in a *staff leadership* conception of the school administrator's role!

Even a cursory scan of the literature in the past twenty years reveals quite a number of variants on the basic theme of *staff leadership* in the study of school administration: *Constructivist Leadership, Critical Leadership, Ethical Leadership, Educative Leadership, Environmental Leadership, Facilitative Leadership, Institutional Leadership, Instructional Leadership, Moral Leadership, Political Leadership, Principle-centered Leadership, Professional Leadership, Servant Leadership, Symbolic Leadership, Transformational*

---

[1]Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 19-23, 1999, Montreal, Canada.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 030 479

Leadership, and Value Leadership. The intentions are good, and the promise of better and more effective teaching and learning in our school is a worthy aspiration for practitioners, researchers, and theoreticians alike.

The theoretical and empirical work on school leadership during the past twenty years has focused on one or a combination of several concerns related to *moral leadership*: values and valuing; the ethical dimensions of school leadership and administration; developing school vision and transforming school effort and purpose; authority relations among teachers and administrators; and the obligations and responsibilities of school leaders. There are other foci, but I believe these are the main concerns.

The remainder of this essay comments on some but not all of these ideas, giving particular attention to several important theoretical and empirical contributions illustrative of the *moral leadership* concept. As will become evident later in this essay, a major contribution within the moral leadership arena that will not be addressed in this essay are studies of *transforming leadership*. There have been important efforts to operationalize and study leadership using Burn's (1978) concept of transforming leadership (Bass, 1985 and Leithwood, 1996, among others), and I will leave it to my colleague Ken Leithwood, also a member of this panel, to address those contributions. Noted below are the contributions during the past twenty years which I would include as among those focused on moral leadership. I am sure this listing is incomplete, limited as my exploration of the literature has been, and I welcome additional nominations.[2]

> *Moral Leadership:* Ashbaugh and Kasten, 1984; Kasten and Ashbaugh, 1991; Begley, 1988, 1996; Blase, 1993; 1995; Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980; 1986; Bottery, 1992; Campbell-Evans, 1991; Dillard, 1995; Duignan and Macpherson, 1993; Duke, 1998; Goldman and Dunlap, 1990; 1991; 1993; Greenfield, W. D. 1991;1985; 1987; 1995; 1998; Greenfield, T. B., 1975; 1979; 1980; Hodgkinson, 1978; 1982; 1986;1991; Kelly and Bredeson, 1991; Lambert, 19 ; Lashway, 1996 Marshall, 1992; Marshall et al, 1996; Moorhead and Nediger, 1991; Reitzug, 1994; Reitzug and Reeves, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1990; 1992; Slater, 1994; Starratt, 1991; 1996; Vandenberghe, 1995; Willower, 1981; 1985; 1994; Wong, 1998.

Moral Leadership in Retrospect

A little over twenty years ago James MacGregor Burns published a book entitled Leadership (1978). He distinguished two types of leadership, transactional and transforming, and

---

[2]For example, there are many contributions focused specifically on ethics and educational administration that are not specifically addressed in this essay, including: Beck and Murphy, 1994; Bull and McCarthy, 1995; Corson, 1985; Enomoto 1997; Heslep 1997; Inbar, 1990; and, Kirby et al 1992, among others.

through this distinction did much to call attention to and legitimize the concept of *moral leadership.* In the Prologue to his book he makes several observations that capture the shift in the focus of research on leadership that would come to characterize the next twenty years of leadership studies in educational administration:

> I will deal with leadership as distinct from mere power-holding and as the opposite of brute power. I will identify two basic types of leadership: the *transactional* and the *transforming*. The relations of most leaders and followers are *transactional* -- leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions. Such transactions comprise the bulk of the relationships among leaders and followers, especially in groups, legislatures, and parties. *Transforming* leadership, while more complex, is more potent. The transforming leader recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But, beyond that, the transforming leader looks for personal motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of
>
> transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents.
>
> This last concept, *moral leadership*, concerns me the most. By this term I mean, first, that leaders and led have a relationship not only of power but of mutual needs, aspirations, and values: second, that in responding to leaders, followers have adequate knowledge of alternative leaders and programs and the capacity to choose among those alternatives; and, third, that leaders take responsibility for their commitments -- if they promise certain kinds of economic, social, and political change, they assume leadership in the bringing about of that change. Moral leadership is not mere preaching, or the uttering of pieties, or the insistence on social conformity. Moral leadership emerges from, and always returns to, the fundamental wants and needs, aspirations, and values of the followers. I mean the kind of leadership that will produce social change that will satisfy followers' authentic needs.
>
> (Burns, 1978:4)

While Burns, a political scientist, was writing largely although not entirely with political leadership in mind, scholars in the fields of management and education were quick to seize on these ideas as guides to study and as the basis for prescribing more effective leadership strategies.

Prior to this time research in educational administration and in management had run into a theoretical brick wall. Yukl's (1981) book on leadership theory and research more or less represented the state of the art as it had developed during the previous two decades: theory and research during the 1960's and 1970's focused on leadership traits, skills, and styles, the two-factor theory encompassing initiating structure and consideration, and the concepts of situational leadership and contingency theory. These ideas, rooted in functionalism and concerned with ideas like efficiency and effectiveness, generally conceived of leadership as a special form of power exercised by individuals and grounded in one or another of French and Raven's (1959) bases of

social power.

There obviously were other developments in the field during this period (circa 1979), and some initiatives were to evolve more fully during the next decade, influencing the study of school leadership in interesting ways. A few of these contributions are noted briefly. Immegart and Boyd (1979) published *Problem Finding in Educational Administration*, setting the stage for a more open-ended exploration of what might count as legitimate study in the field of educational administration. Among the important contributors to that volume (an outgrowth of one of the few -- and perhaps the last (?) -- career development seminars in educational administration) were Jacob Getzels, Thomas B. Greenfield, Daniel Griffiths, and Donald Willower. Another publication that year was Erickson and Reller's (1979) edited volume, *The Principal in Metropolitan Schools*, created as a conceptual supplement to the urban school simulation known as Monroe City (including Wilson Elementary School, Janus Junior High, and Abraham Lincoln High School), and developed by the University Council for Educational Administration during the previous decade to help in the training of school leaders for metropolitan (urban) schools. Among the important contributors to this effort were Joan Meskin, Rodney Reed, Francis Schrag, and William Wayson.

These eight contributors are mentioned because what they had to say at the time (1979) foreshadowed much of what was to transpire over the next several decades in terms of the study of school leaders, and especially in terms of the concept of *moral leadership*. Written in the context of contention regarding the efficacy of the "theory movement" in educational administration, Jacob Getzels' essay reminds us of the difficulty and the importance of *problem-finding* to research and theory development, and I believe his encouragement loosened us up a bit, as a field, stimulating scholars to give renewed attention to the search for new and significant problems of practice that promise the possibility of new theory developments. Much was to change over the next twenty years regarding the focus and assumptions guiding scholarship in the field. Thom Greenfield made several important observations, among them the idea that there are alternative ways to view and think about school organizations, and the idea that *soft* data of the sort generated through qualitative approaches may bring us closer to understanding the more important realities of school organizations and the meanings of those experiences for participants. Dan Griffiths called into question the efficacy of the then dominant paradigm (that organizational goals shape member behaviors and motives; that social systems concepts mirror the experience of participants; that bureaucratic structures guide behavior; that decision making is a systematic process; etc.) guiding the study of educational administration, suggesting it "...no longer is fruitful in generating powerful concepts and hypotheses; it does not allow us to describe either modern organizations or the people in them; and, as a result, it is not helpful to administrators..." (1979:51). He called for a greater emphasis on descriptive field studies of administrator behavior, indicated the need for new conceptions of authority, and suggested that negotiation and bargaining might be important ways to conceptualize the day-to-day interactions of school participants. Don Willower implored his colleagues to not dismiss any useful way of doing research on school organizations, and reminded all in attendance that, while there may be

problems with the then current state of theory development, the field of educational administration had come quite a way since its beginning in the 50's, in terms of contributions to understanding the nature of school organization and its implications for school administrators.

Reflecting to a large degree the simulated urban school administration context which their conceptualizations were intended to address, the contributors to Erickson and Reller's (1979) *The Principal in Metropolitan Schools* presaged many of the *moral leadership* research foci to evolve during the 80's and 90's, including: the attention given to the importance of race, class, and gender in teaching and learning and school administration; the emergence of women as school leaders and as researchers and professors of educational administration; the recognition of and inclusion of teachers as leaders and as important contributors to school improvement decisions and initiatives; and the emergence of the moral and the ethical dimensions of school leadership. Joan Meskin examined studies of women as school principals, reminding the field of their generally positive performance as school leaders and, particularly, of their "...propensity toward democratic leadership, thoroughness of approach to problem solving, and talent in instructional leadership, as well as the general effectiveness of their performance as rated by both teachers and superiors ..." (p. 339) Rodney Reed, writing about education and ethnicity, anticipated the increasing racial and ethnic diversity that would come to characterize not just urban schools. He implored school administrators and teachers to change their attitudes and behaviors toward ethnic minority students and their parents: "The entire staff (from building principal to custodian) of all schools (from kindergarten through the university) should develop an understanding of, and an appreciation and a respect for, all students, regardless of ethnicity and socioeconomic circumstances." (p. 146) Fran Schrag, writing about the principal as a moral actor, foreshadowed many of the issues to be explored over the next twenty years by scholars in the field. He offered four ideas regarding what adopting a moral point of view implies for a school administrator:

> 1. A moral agent must base his decisions on principles that apply to classes of situations, not on a whim of the moment or a predilection for one particular kind of situation. These principles must be meant for all human beings; they should not benefit or burden any group or class within society. The principles must also be impartial, or, stated another way, the effect must be reversible. This means that an actor must be willing to adhere to the principles even if his role in the moral situation were to be reversed and he were the one to whom the principle was being applied.
>
> 2. A moral agent should consider the welfare and interests of *all* who stand to be affected by his decision or action, including himself.
>
> 3. A moral agent has the obligation to base his decision on the most complete information relative to the decision that he can obtain.
>
> 4. A conscientious moral agent's moral judgements are prescriptive. He must

> acknowledge that, when he has fully examined a situation calling for his decision and reached a conclusion, he has thereby answered the question: What ought I to *do*? If he acts otherwise, it is through weakness of will or through failure to take the moral obligation seriously.
>
> (pp. 208-209)

As will become evident further along in this essay, one of the limitations of the studies of moral leadership that have been done during the past 20 years is that few scholars define very clearly what they mean when they refer to *moral leadership*. Schrag's ideas are among the more helpful conceptions. Finally, Bill Wayson discusses what he refered to as the leadership shortage in schools, and observes that: "Leadership must be translated into action by the people who *consent* [italics added] to be led. A principal who wants to lead must learn how to facilitate a staff's collectively learning how to express leadership.... *The principal should create conditions that will elicit leadership behaviors from everyone* [italics added] in the building in circumstances and at times that their contribution is essential for achieving the school's purposes". (p. 67)

To summarize, scholars in 1979 were writing about many of the *moral leadership* issues that would catch the attention of a few of their colleagues over the next 20 years. It also is clear from the literature that many of these concerns were not new in 1979. Chester Barnard (1938) wrote about the importance of the executive's responsibility to serve as a *moral teacher* for employees. Herbert Simon (1947), writing about decision making, recognized that decisions have *ethical* as well as factual content. Getzels (1960), in developing his social systems model of a classroom (later to become an extensively used theoretical framework guiding countless doctoral dissertations and other research in educational administration), included *values* as one of the *cultural* dimensions shaping role expectations for individuals. Even the 1964 NSSE Yearbook, entitled *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration* (Griffiths, 1964), contains a veritable cornucopia of ideas relevant to understanding the complexities of school leadership (see especially the chapters by Lipham, Hemphill, and Iannaccone). These ideas have been part of the field for many years, but only in the past twenty or so have they begun to receive attention by scholars in educational administration. There undoubtedly are many reasons for this, some of which are discussed briefly in the next section.

Theoretical Underpinnings

There are quite a number of important theoretical underpinnings supporting the *moral leadership* concept. As I've tried to show, it is not a new concept, although it has received more attention during the past twenty years than ever before. While a broad constellation of factors probably account for the attention given to the concept (including the decline in attention by organizational theory scholars (Pfeffer, 1982) to the concept of leadership as it was understood prior to Burn's (1978) contribution; the emergence within educational administration of attention

to the critical humanist perspective (Foster, 1986; and Giroux, 1991) and ethical dimensions of school leadership and administration (Miklos, 1978; Willower, 1979; and Corson, 1985); and the broader turmoil related to challenges to functionalism and the positivist traditions in our field (Greenfield, 1978; and Griffiths, 1979).

While it is an incomplete discussion, the comments to follow regarding the theoretical contributions of Mike Bottery, Thom Greenfield, Christopher Hodgkinson, Tom Sergiovanni, Robert Starrat, and Don Willower will be noted and discussed very briefly to suggest how their ideas have been helpful as guides to the study and understanding of moral leadership. Obviously there are other scholars who have made important contributions to our understanding of ethics and the value dimension of educational administration. The particular contributions noted here are fairly representative of the range of what I refer to as theoretical scholarship grounding the *moral leadership* concept. As readers think of others contributions that might be included within this general criterion I hope they will share their nomination(s).

Bottery (1992) offers a comprehensive and clear treatise on the ethics of educational management. His book includes discussion of a broad range of perspectives on ethics and educational management, arguing that administrators and leaders must act and choose, and that choice is inevitably subject and that selection of one or another course of action will be based on a set of values. He offers a conception of ethical leadership rooted in a conception of practice guided by the obligation of the school leader to ask six fundamental questions:

1. Does the management of the school promote personal growth?
2. Does it treat people as ends in themselves or as means to ends?
3. Does it foster a rationality which is not only tolerant of criticism, but actually sees it as an essential part of school and society?
4. Does it repudiate the view of human beings as resources to be manipulated, and instead see them as resourceful humans?
5. Does it creat an ethos where measures of democracy can be introduced to be replicated within the society at large?
6. Does it foster an appreciation of the place of individuals as citizens within their own communities, states, and world?

(Bottery, 1992: 5-6)

Bottery's view is that the ethical school administrator must lead in a manner where-in one's leadership is critical, transformative, visionary, educative, empowering, liberating, personally ethical, organizationally ethical, and responsible. This is a big order. One of the difficulties with much of the scholarship focused on ethics is that it does not offer an integrated and comprehensive perspective regarding what ethical school administration might entail. Bottery satisfies this limitation for me in that he encompasses prescriptions for action within a view of schooling that embraces the development children *and* adults as a primary purpose.

Another contribution that is comprehensive, clear, and compelling is that offered by Starratt (1996). He posits that the "administering of meaning, the administering of community, and the administering of excellence" (xviii) are the primary work of the school administrator. An important issue for Starratt is that not only must school administrators help schools through the current challenges they face, but that a more important and second-order priority is to develop schools into *communities that work*. That is, to foster practices and the development of structures and norms which are supportive of the concept of *a learning community* in the fullest and best sense of that idea. Starratt grounds his views in a rich tapestry of ideas about what it means to be a moral school leader and manages as well to provide concrete, practical guidance regarding how one might actually implement his ideas. Perhaps the most valuable contribution of this work is the power and the scope of the ethical ideas he brings to bear in articulating his vision. "One way administrators can build a moral community is to encourage individual teachers to nuture the foundational qualities of autonomy, connectedness, and transcendence in their classrooms, as well as communicate the large ethical framework of justice, critique, and care." (p. 164)

Starratt reminds us of the distinction between ethics as the *study* of moral practice [and there is much written in educational administration that is best thought of in terms of this tradition] and *being moral*, which "..involves more than thinking and making moral judgements. Morality involves the total person as a human being; it involves the human person living in a community of other moral agents. Morality is a way of living and a way of being.... We can then see administration as a moral way of being with teachers and students." (p. 155) Starratt offers a vision about what it might mean for a school to be a moral community:

> If schools are to teach the larger connections -- connections to our ancestors, to the biosphere, to the cultural heroes of the past, to the agenda of the future -- they must begin with the connections of everyday experience, the connections to our peers, to our extended families, to the cultural dynamics of our neighborhoods, and to the politics and economics and technology in the homes and on the streets of the neighborhood. In other words, they have to learn to understand the life world of their immediate environment, how people relate to authority, to beauty, to nature, and to conflict. They should be led to appreciate all the connections in their immediate environment, for that environment is a metaphor for the field physics of the human, social, and natural worlds.
>
> (Starratt, 1996: 77)

A major part of the school administrator's *moral* responsibility is to help the school define and develop itself as a learning community, to help members of that community make meaning of their worlds and reinvent their schools for the twenty-first century. These are powerful images of the school as a moral community. Thus, as we study *moral leadership* in schools we seek a three-fold understanding: (1) *what* is the administrator doing and being in relations with others; (2) with *what* consequences for others and for the administrator; and (2) doing and being *toward what*

ends? Starratt's contribution helps us understand the fundamental importance of the *end-in-view* to ***being*** a moral school leader.

Thom Greenfield has made numerous contributions toward helping us understand the essential human character of school organizations, their educative purpose, and the moral nature of the administrator's task. Related to these ideas is his view of the school organization through the lense of the phenomenologist -- for Greenfield there is no other view that makes sense, and in large measure I agree. Schools, as organizations, are peopled; they are socially constructed realities that live in our imaginations, and in our lived experience. As members of social groups called schools, teachers, administrators, and children interact and construct meaning (Blumer, 1969), and their constructions both mediate their experience of the world and shape their response to that world. Greenfield states:

> In identifying organizations as social invention, the alternative view identifies organization with man's image of himself and with the particular and distinctive ways in which people see the world around them and their place in it. This view is the perspective of phenomenology. In it organizations are the perceived social reality within which people make decisions and take actions which seem right and proper to them (Greenfield, 1973, 557). The heart of the view is not a single abstraction called organization, but rather varied perceptions by *individuals* [italics not in original] of what they can, should, or must do in dealing with others within the circumstances in whcih they find themselves.
>
> (Greenfield and Ribbons, 1993: 6)

Here-in lies much of the complexity of understanding school leadership and administration, and particularly the phenomenon of *moral leadership*. Reality in school organizations, as elsewhere, is socially constructed through symbolic interaction among the parties to that social situation. The constructed reality is not only a product of the immediate social interaction of the participants, but includes as well the lived experiences of the participants, which they bring to that social interaction; experience and meaning turn over upon themselves in the moment. Now, much of what transpires occurs out of habit -- responses learned, internalized, and enacted often without conscious consideration -- people have been socialized to certain expectations and social conventions. Schools are nested within containing community and societal cultures, and the norms and values of those larger social sphere's mediate and shape what transpires among people within the school; just as do sub-cultures within the school itself; just as our respective social class, religion, educational level, race, family customs, ethnicity, and gendered background experiences shape how and what we see, and what we come to understand in attributing meaning to our lived experinece. Social life is complex! *Moral leadership* in schools seeks to bring members of that community together around common purposes in a manner that entails being *deliberately* moral in one's conduct -- toward and with others and oneself, and in the

service of purposes and activities that seek to meet the best needs of all children and adults.

Hodgkinson (1978, 1983, 1991), perhaps more than any scholar in our field, has contributed to our understanding of the *moral leadership* concept, and the idea that school administration is inherently a moral activity. His ideas are complex and do not lend themselves to easy application, either as a guide to practice or as a guide to inquiry. Never-the-less, while his views have been criticized (Evers, 1985; Lakomski, 1987), Hodgkinson offers a clear and comprehensive (and complicated) theoretical framework for understanding values and valuing in educational leadership. His values framework includes three types of values: transrational (Type I); Rational (Type II); and Subrational (Type III). Arranged in hierarchical fashion, Hodgkinson places Type I values (transrational) at the top. These are values grounded in metphysical principle -- ethical codes or injunctions. They are unverifiable in the scientific sense, and they cannot be justified by merely logical argument. The characteristic of Type I values is that they are based on the will rather than upon the reasoning faculty; their adoption implies some kind of act of faith, belief, commitment." (1991: 99) The example here might be "Thou shalt not kill".
At the lower end of the hierarchy are Type III values. These types of values "are self-justifying, since they are grounded in individual affect and constitute the individual's preference structure. Why is *x* good? Because I like it. Why do I like it? I like it because I like it". (91) Hodgkinson refers to Type III values as "primitives". The middle-range, Type II values, are more complex than either Type I or Type III. *Reasoning* tied to the collective good or to consequences for others is the determinant of what is right and good regarding Type II values. That is, Type II values are judged either in terms of the consensus of a given collectivity, for example, the faculty of a school, or on the basis of a reasoned analysis of the consequences of the value, in terms of its anticipated desirability given a resultant future state of affairs. "The analysis of consequences presupposes a social context and a given scheme of social norms, expectations, and standards." (98) The processes entailed in judging Type II values are cognitive, and the philosophical grounds would be rooted in Humanism, Pragmatism, or Utilitarianism. It is Type II values that the school administrator must manage. The foregoing does not do justice to Hodgkinson's framework, and the reader is cautioned to read Hodgkinson's work in the original in order that all the nuances and complexities of his views are understood. [Begley (1988; 1996) has applied Hodkinson's typology in several instances and found it useful as an explanatory framework.] For Hodgkinson, there is no doubt that values are central to the administrator's work, and that school administration *is* a moral art!

Willower (1981, 1985, 1987, 1994) has contributed extensively to helping the field understand the philosophical dimensions of educational administration, and his observations always are keen. While much of his critique has focused on the efficacy of theory and research in our field, he returns consistently, throughout his work, to the consideration of values in the administrator's work, and in returning again and again to this theme, he reenforces the need for scholarship focused on values and valuing in the "doing" of administrative work in schools. As he states so succinctly:

> The great question of ethics is "What is right?". Central here are such matters as the nature of the good society, presumably including the good organization and the good school, the good life, and what one ought to do in situations that require judgements of value and moral choices. (1981, 115-116)

And again:

> ...the fundamental problem is negotiating the maze in which good intentions are translated into desirable outcomes. It is not the values held by administrators and other educators; most are committed to helping students learn and grow. The difficulties arise when the desirable and undesirable consequences of alternative moral choices are closely balanced or hard to predict. This underscores the importance of the organizational and environmental context of moral choices and the intimate interrelation of such choices to empirical judgements about particular consequences. These areas should be the key concerns of scholarship and teaching on values in educational administration. (1981, 132-133)

And again:

> Values should be a key concern in educational administration. While the distinction between the normative "ought" and the descriptive "is" has been useful from the standpoint of linguistic clarity, the normative and descriptive are thoroughly intermixed in everyday life. ...Practitioners must frequently choose among competing values and institute courses of action that they hope will achieve desirable aims. ...Visions and ideals can inspire, can confer a course of direction, and motivate action. ...Genuine moral choice occurs in the context of competing goods, or quite often, the lesser of two evils. When a desirable outcome is easy to attain or when the decision is between a clear good and a clear evil, serious deliberation is not required. The intermixture of the normative and the descriptive means that a critical dimension of ethical judgement lies in the estimation of an alternative's consequences. Is it likely that the alternative in question can be succesfully implemented? What are the chances that the attempt to implement it will fail and leave the involved individuals and the organization worse off than before? What are the potential side effects and unintended consequences of the course of action, and can they be dealt with or headed off as part of the overall implementation effort? ...The kind of complexities and questions just considered are at the heart of valuation in educational administration. (1985, 14-16)

As Willower observes: "The location of morality in everyday life means, for instance, that what students of educational administration call practice is chiefly an ethical undertaking, that is, a matter of the reflective appraisal of the values served by various decision options". (1994, 8) It is

clear, for Willower, that values are central in the lives of school administrators. In an earlier discussion of inquiry in the field he suggests a variety of dimensions of the administrator's life that should be more central to inquiry than they have been here-to-fore. While published in 1987, Willower's suggestions are just as relevant today: "exhibiting vision, connecting everyday activities to values, cultivating shared goals, meanings, norms, and commitments, creating purposeful symbols, images, and self-fulfilling prophecies, drawing out the ideas of others, protecting dissent, shaping consensus in and among various constituencies, managing conflict, negotiating for political support and material resources, building coalitions, focusing energies, and managing multiple problems and undertakings." (1987, 21) Many, perhaps all, of these foci may be said to fall within the province of *moral leadership*; certainly most do. Recurring throughout Willower's scholarly contributions is a perspective on school administration that is consonant with the *moral leadership* concept.

Sergiovanni (1990, 1992) has done much to introduce these ideas more broadly. Building on the works of numerous researchers and scholars, Sergiovanni integrates a broad range of complex and interrelated leadership concepts into a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts. This idea, that the whole often *is* greater than the sum of its parts, is emphasized here because it captures so well an important quality of *moral leadership* as a concept. *Moral leadership* entails an overlapping and integration of many ideas, and discussions of the concept are frequently ambiguous and incomplete. While Sergiovanni's contributions in this area may be faulted to some extent as too "thin", his conceptions of *moral leadership* cover a lot of important ground and provide readers with a good introduction to what such leadership might entail. In exploring the idea of value-added leadership, Sergiovanni (1990) suggests nine dimensions are constitutive of this kind of leadership:

1. An emphasis on leadership added to effective management;

2. Encouraging performance investment by teachers, which means going beyond the traditional contractual investment to one where-in workers gain opportunities for deeper levels of personal satisfaction. Rewards are intrinsic;

3. Going beyond the instrumental dimension of situational leadership to being responsive to the expressive needs of teachers;

4. Articulating one's vision for the school, and going beyond this to cultivating and developing the authentic needs, interests, values, and beliefs of teachers. The school's vision ultimately must be owned by the teachers;

5. Providing teachers the support and discretion they need to accomplish what is important in terms of their shared purposes and understandings as a community;

6. Creating conditions which promote a feeling of responsibility among teachers for deciding the best means to accomplish the tasks and purposes they aspire to achieve;

7. Emphasizing conditions within the school which emphasize work that is intrinsically rewarding from the teacher's viewpoint;

8. Building a working environment that emphasizes collegiality among teachers, and between teachers and the school principal;

9. Emphasizing passionate leadership that reflects deep levels of caring and commitment, among teachers as well as by the principal. to meeting the group's standards of excellence; and which results in genuine outrage being voiced when key community values become threatened.

(Sergiovanni, 1990, 14-29)

Moral leadership "taps the spirit" (p. 28), and taken together these nine dimensions cultivate an authority relationship with teachers that has moral characteristics. Sergiovanni views the relationship among leaders and followers in this way:

> Whenever there is an unequal distribution of power between two people, the relationship becomes a moral one. Leadership involves an offer to control. The follower accepts this offer on the assumption that control will not be exploited. In this sense leadership is not a right but a responsibility. Its purpose is not to enhance the leader but the school. Leaders administer to the needs of the school by being of service and providing help. The test of moral leadership is whether the competence, well-being, and independence of the follower is enhanced as a result of accepting control and whether the enterprise of which both are a part ultimately benefits. In schools that means teaching and learning are enhanced and the developmental needs of students are honored. (p. 28)

Building on the idea of value-added leadership, Sergiovanni (1992) develops his ideas further in a more direct exploration of the idea of *moral leadership*. In the preface to his book he explains his perspective:

> The management values now considered legitimate are biased toward rationality, logic, objectivity, the importance of self-interest, explicitness, individuality, and detachment. *Emphasizing* these values causes us to neglect emotions, the importance of group membership, sense and meaning, morality, self-sacrifice, duty, and obligation as *additional* values. Furthermore, the bases of authority for today's leadership opractice rely heavily on bureaucracy, psychological knowledge or skill, and the technical rationality that emerges from theory and research. *Emphasizing* these three bases causes us to *neglect* professional and moral authority as *additional* bases for leadership practice. ...What we need is an expanded theoretical and operational foundation for leadership practice that will give balance to the full range of values and

> authority. I refer to this expanded foundation as the *moral dimension in leadership*. (p. xiii)

Sergiovanni outlines his view of the virtuous school and discusses the importance of a covenant of shared values to the school as a moral community. The covenant of shared values is the basis for determining the school's morality (p. 108), and the work of moral leadership entails drawing on the full range of leadership values and authority noted above, particularly the leader's professional and moral authority. There are many interesting ideas in Sergiovanni's writing and they warrant further exploration, both empirically and theoretically. The essay turns now to a brief review of some of the empirical research that has been done to explore more fully, and more concretely, the meanings of the *moral leadership* concept.

Empirical Studies (1979-1999)

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980; 1986) studied principals' conceptions of their school leadership roles. Based on qualitative depth interviews of eight male and female elementary and secondary principals selected because of their reputation as exceptionally effective leaders, Blumberg and Greenfield observed among other qualities that each principal held a clear personal vision of what they believed it was important to achieve in their schools. Working with and through teachers, and motivated by their commitment to particular ends-in-view, these eight principals were observed to share common orientations toward their work. They were: "(1) desiring and eager to make their schools over in "their" image, (2) proactive and quick to assume the initiative, and (3) resourceful in being able to structure their roles and the demands on their time in a way that permitted them to pursue what might be termed their personal objectives as principals". (1980:201) A follow-up study of these 7 principals and 9 others about ten years after the initial study highlighted the importance of school culture and the centrality of the ethical dilemmas that are part of principals' daily lives: that values and valuing are central to the actions taken and decisions made by principals. That there is a moral component to being a principal, and that it is central to doing the daily work of the principal, was further reenforced in the second study.

Kasten and Ashbaugh (1991), "defining values as criteria for 'judgement, preference, and choice'"(p.61), studied the place of espoused values in superintendents' work. They interviewed a convenience sample of 15 superintendents (including those early in their career as well as more seasoned veterans) from both large and small districts surrounding a Midwestern (U.S.A.) metropolitan area. All subjects were white and male, and had worked in education for over 20 years. Data were collected using an open-ended two-part interview guided by a protocol intended to elicit responses revealing of the superintendents' assumptions about: "relationships between the organization and the environment; the nature of reality and truth; the nature of human nature; the nature of human activity; and the nature of human relationships". (p.57) The second part of the interview asked superintendents "about the qualities they value in subordinates, about factors that have limited their professional success, and about criteria they use to determine when problems

have been resolved successfully. Superintendents were also asked to describe the most serious problems they had faced in their careers and what they considered to be their greatest career achievements". (p.57) Results of the study indicate these superintendents place a very high emphasis on subordinates' human relations skills and other values generally congruent with the conventional wisdom in educational administration." (p.64) The researchers' recognize the limits of their approach to understanding the place of values in superintendents' work, and conclude with observations regarding the importance of studying actual values in use and the possibility that superintendent values may be shaped by longevity in a single school district and a single geographical area.

Kelly and Bredeson (1991) studied principals of public and parochial high schools as symbol managers. Using symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969) as their guiding theoretical perspective, Kelly and Bredeson conducted depth interviews, participant observation, and document analysis of the principals, teachers, and other staff in two high schools over a five month period. The study sites included a rural public high school and a parochial high school; both schools served about 500 students, and staff size was about the same for each. Data were categorized in terms of words, actions, and rewarding behaviors. Analyzed in terms of their symbolic meaning relative to each school's culture, the study's results revealed a number of leadership messages being communicated by the principals in the two schools: "Educating the whole student; a notion of educational balance; authority; the treatment of values; a sense of community; and professional norms and ethics." (p. 14) Values were central in the daily lives of both principals, and there were clear differences both in the content of the values reenforced, and in the manner of reenforcement. "The differences were played out more in what might be described as "intentional engagement" of values at St. Mary's versus the "smooth dance of pluralistic relativity" at Franklin". (p. 16) Kelly and Bredeson conclude that "... symbolic leadership is the integration and communication of a principal's thoughts words, and actions. These integrated messages were communicated through the patterned use of words, actions, and rewards that had an impact on the beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviors of others with whom the principal interacted. No single word, act or reward in and of itself epitomized symbolic leadership. Each gesture must be construed in terms of the setting in which it occurred.... Conveying core values, images and ideologies, the symbols transmitted through words, actions and rewards served to reenforce the philosophy of the school; to motivate and/or hinder efforts of subcultures whose goals/interests might be in conflict with the larger culture; to legitimate authority and organizational mission, and to maintain the status quo." (pp. 19-20) There are two important messages here: comparative studies are powerfully revealing of *cultural* phenomena, and the "whole" of *moral leadership* is greater than the sum of its parts.

Greenfield (1991) studied the micropolitical behavior of an urban elementary school principal using interpretivist methods. Relying on depth interviews with teachers and the school principal, and observations of the teachers and the principal, Greenfield found that the principal used a *professional* style of leadership which entailed working "...in a cooperative and collaborative fashion with teachers, viewing teachers as full partners in the school's effort to serve

the best interests of all children." ( ). He offered the following observations regarding how the basis of the principal's leadership and relationship with teachers in this school differs in important ways from the control orientation observed by Ball (1987): "The value of this extension of Ball's framework is that it moves beyond a conflict and exchange model of power and influence [as in Burn's (1978) transactional leadership] to one where-in the currency-in-use is a shared *moral* [italics added] commitment to serve the best interests of all schoolchildren [similar to Burn's idea of transforming, or moral leadership]. The concept of the *professional* school leader, as an ideal-type, is in harmony with a view of the school as a primarily normative organization in which the exercise of power ideally seeks to foster compliance rooted in a moral level of involvement (Etzioni, 1964). In such a circumstance the most potent sources of power are the shared norms, values, ideals, and beliefs of the participants themselves. Thus, in a school, the challenge for the principal is to foster an increasing number of shared commitments at a *moral* [italics added]level among the broadest possible range of participants. Under these conditions, participants do what they do because they believe it is the right thing to do." ( )

Moorhead and Nediger (1991) studied the impact of values on the daily activities of four secondary principals in different Canadian school districts. None of the schools were located in communities serving affluent or professional families. One of the four principals was female, and all four principals had a strong reputation as effective leaders. Employing a combination of qualitative, ethnographic methods and quantitative surveys, data were collected from principals, teachers, and students over a two-year period. The study employed analytical schemes based on the works of Hodgkinson (1983) and Frankena (1963) to help differentiate among observed values. Results indicated that the observed behaviors of the four principals reflected quite different activities, and that the differences could be accounted for by the principals' differing principles, non-moral values, moral values, and educational beliefs. The researchers' offer the following by way of illustrating the impact of values on daily activities:

Principal 1, when speaking of dropouts, overcrowding, and "turkeys", stated that:

> I define a turkey as a kid who needs a great deal of mature guidance, and when they don't get that guidance they screw up. We are cramped with time and we don't give them the guidance that they need, and they are gone. I hate to see turkeys turn into buzzards... In the 27 years (that I have been in education) I remember only one kid that I couldn't reach. *I really believe* that if we can spend time with the students they won't drop out.

Principal 4, on the other hand, stated:

> I think the dropout problem is overplayed. School, its not for everybody. What some people are saying is that everybody should be in school X number of years. It doesn't work that way... I think there are some kids

> that school is just not their cup of tea and they'll do a cracking good job doing something somewhere else...
>
> The consequences of these differing beliefs can be seen in the activities undertaken. [Principal 1] Actively (he) sought a third vice principal so that there could be more counseling of potential dropouts; counseled students personally as the opportunity arose; and supported the athletic programme as a way of keeping some students in school. Principal 4, on the other hand, did not encourage any counselling for potential dropouts and was not particularly interested in special student retention programmes. As a results of his convictions, he did nothing beyond extremely accurate record keeping in the area. Neither Principal 2 nor 3 expressed, during our observations or in the interviews, any opinions or beliefs specifically on the dropout question. Nor did we observe any actions geared towards that problem.
>
> (Moorhead and Nediger, pp.12-13)

The researchers conclude that the observed principals each had different concerns at the center of their value systems, and that these differences resulted in the principals' administering their schools in different ways. Another conclusion reached is that, in terms of their effectiveness within the communities they served, the particular value orientations of the principals were not as critical as the "fit" between an individual principal's values and those of the community and school served.

Marshall (1992a) studied the values of what she refered to as "atypical" principals and assistant principals. Using open-ended interviews and the constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), Marshall conducted two interviews with "26 administrators who were atypical, in the sense that they veered from the norm of White male risk-avoiders. The sample was composed of 5 male minorities, 9 female minorities, 8 White females, and 4 "risk-taker" White males". (p. 372) The first phase chose administrators from two southern districts, while the second phase of the study included administrators in and around a large urban district in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The initial interview focused on "career decision making, socialization, and ways of managing the job", and the second "asked administrators to describe an ethical dilemma they had faced and the process of managing that dilemma". (p. 372) Administrators reported experiencing dilemmas: "Over asserting authority and enforcing bureaucratic rules; ...In supervising and evaluating teachers; ...Stemming from helping children and solving societal ills; ...Arising from parent pressure". (p. 373-376) The respondents reported that the "dilemmas described *had become dilemmas because there was no clear and sensible guidance from policy or a professional code*. The phrase "judgement call" kept recurring in their talk as they described their management of ethical dilemmas, and they kept referring to religion and family background [as] providing guidance." (p. 376) Respondents also referred to their own core values during the course of the interviews: "fairness, caring, and openness" and "respecting the community". (p. 377-381) The study reveals much about the interplay among the personal values of administrators, and the moral dilemmas they experience in balancing the bureaucratic

standards of schools and their efforts to help children overcome the effects of racism, sexism and poverty.

Reitzug and Reeves (1992) studied an elementary principal's use of symbolic leadership to influence school culture and explored the distinction between using symbolic leadership in manipulative and nonmanipulative ways. The school and principal were chosen through a process of nomination from among 75 elementary schools in a single district, and through various sources all indications are that it indeed was a school perceived to be a "positive exemplar of school and principal effectiveness". (p. 189) An interpretivist perspective (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; 1978) guided open-ended interviews with all 41 staff members, school documents and other artifacts were collected, and observations of the principal and various school activities were conducted over a 3-month period. The resultant data-based narrative reveals much about the interplay of the principal's values, the culture of Carver Elementary School, and relations with and among teachers. Reitzug and Reeves relied upon the work of Starratt (1991) to guide their examination of events in terms of manipulation and empowerment, finding that on most occasions the principal's symbolic leadership behavior was empowering, that on some occasions it was both manipulative and empowering, and that some behaviors could be construed as manipulative. The researchers develop a taxonomy of symbolic leadership guided by Sergiovanni's (1984, 1991) leadership forces model, differentiating among technical, human, and educational forms, and symbolic/cultural actions, language, and artifacts. Reitzug and Reeves conclude with six propositions about symbolic leadership in schools:

1. Symbolic leadership takes place on two levels. *Overt* symbolic leadership occurs in forms that are nonroutine (e.g., slogans, stories, songs, and ceremonies). *Embedded* symbolic leadership results from individual interpretations of the meaning of routine daily actions, language, and discrete visual symbols.

2. Behavior contains an external *substantive* and an internal *symbolic* component.

3. Frequently, there is a discrepancy between the leadership force represented by the substantive component of behavior and the force represented by the symbolic component.

4. *Actions taken* (i.e., commitment of time, energy, or resources), *language used* (oral, written, and nonverbal), and *artifacts created* (permanent or semipermanent aspects of the school) are mediums through which symbolic messages are sent to followers.

5. Management and leadership are not separate functions. Part of a principal's leadership occurs through the symbolic messages that are communicated in the fulfillment of management duties.

6. Symbolic and cultural leadership are inseparable. As principals practice symbolic

leadership, they simultaneously practice cultural leadership.

(Reitzug and Reeves, pp: 211-216)

This study of symbolic leadership by an elementary school principal reveals much about the moral and conceptual complexity associated with "making meaning" within the context of a school's culture, and in relationship to the actions taken, the language used, and the artifacts created in connection with a principal's leadership and management efforts. A particularly provocative observation is the *intertwining* of instructional, managerial, and human leadership foci, and the inseparability of symbolic and cultural leadership. Again, we see the "whole" of *moral leadership* is greater than the sum of its parts.

In a secondary analysis of data from the preceding study, Reitzug (1994) looked in greater depth for examples of empowering principal behavior and further explored the distinctions between manipulative and nonmanipulative symbolic leadership. Broadening the initial conceptual framework on empowerment (Carr and Kemis, 1986; Schwab, 1983) by refining and operationalizing Prawat's (1991) empowerment model, Reitzug created the Developmental Taxonomy of Empowering Principal Behavior. This framework offers specific descriptors and data-based behavioral illustrations associated with three categories of empowering behavior: support, facilitation, and possibility. Analyzing data from the Carr Elementary School study (Reitzug and Reeves, 1992), Reitzug finds empirical support for the three categories of empowering behavior:

Support

Mr. G [the school principal]facilitated the development of a supportive environment for critique by *providing autonomy with responsibility for supporting practice, shifting problem-solving responsibility to teachers, communicating trust, encouraging risk-taking, honoring teachers' opinions, developing teams, and modeling inquiry,*

Facilitation

...Facilitation refers to actions and behavior that promote specific acts of critique. Mr. G stimulated critique by *asking teachers questions that stimulated examination of teaching practice, requiring justification of practice based on personal practical knowledge, practicing critique by wandering around, and providing alternative frameworks for thinking about teaching and learning,*

Possibility

...Possibility is leadership behavior that makes it possible to actualize the products of critique and voice. Mr. G facilitated possibility by *providing* teachers *tangible*

> *resources (i.e., money, equipment, and materials) and intangible resources (i.e., time and opportunity), encouraging grant writing, and soliciting donations of funds and materials.* (Reitzug, pp: 292-303)

Reitzug's data provide concrete field-based examples of *moral leadership*, that is, leadership that empowers teachers through invitation, example, and opportunity to critique their practice and to benefit from the results of critique in ways that preserve their dignity as persons and their rights as professionals. The daily leadership behaviors reported here are examples of ethics in action. They offer concrete illustrations of how principals can concurrently "fulfill their responsibility for moving schools forward without imposing their way upon teachers, and how to honor teacher beliefs while remaining true to their personal beliefs". (p. 305)

Dillard's (1995) case study of an African American, female, high school principal's constructions of what it means, in her lived experience, to be a principal, offers a vivid and engaging illustration of the significance and importance of the personal qualities (gender, race, social class background, education, and myriad other qualities that distinguish each of us as individuals) brought to that role. Rosefield High School is an ethnically diverse metropolitan school serving about 800 students. Dillard's methodologically complex and controversial research strategy is largely constructivist in orientation, adopting a critical feminist perspective. She seeks not only to understand how this principal views and interprets her experience of the principalship as an African American woman, but strives as well, through this study, to transform "...our current conceptualizations of what leadership is and what leadership means". (p. 543) In adopting this strategy Dillard reveals not only a great deal regarding the importance of the personal qualities of the principal for why and how leadership is enacted, but illustrates as well the political nature of research and of the methods employed by researchers. (Bell, 1992; Casey, 1993; Hill-Collins, 1990; Freire, 1970; hooks, 1989 and 1992; Lorde, 1984; and Pharr, 1988) Based on the data in her study, Dillard argues that conceptions of leading or effectiveness cannot be created without considering culture and community context. Dillard refers to Natham, the principal in this study, to illustrate her point: "Here we saw a woman whose agenda for leadership was clear: to (re)construct a culture at Rosefield High School aimed particularly toward "the good of Black folks" and other students of color particularly, and all students more generally". (p. 558) She concludes with some important observations, grounded in her data:

> ...the actions of effective school leaders are grounded in subjective interpretations and understandings arising from personal biographies, which are always located in a more collective (and sometimes connected) history. The ways in which Natham felt, thought, and acted were not random but arose from the way she grew up, the stories and lessons of her youth and community, and her own schooling experiences.
>
> ...that she was an African American, a woman, and a Catholic person mattered greatly to her constructions, actions, and understandings of her work as a teacher and an effective administrator. However, it is also important to consider that these socially

> constructed understandings and actions are not only true for those we commonly categorize as "minorities" or women, but are also true for those who are White and male as well.
>
> ... effective leadership is transformative political work. School principals always work on behalf of particular values, projects, and peoples, those choices arising from their personal subjective understandings of the world and the work.
>
> (Dillard, 1995: 558-560)

Dillard's study offers compelling evidence of *moral leadership* in action, providing insight into the complex connections between a principal's background and past experience, the personal qualities and sensitivities brought to the moment of reflection, and the valuing and intention revealed through action (leading) in a particular school culture and community context.

Vandenberghe (1995) report the differences in the orientations of teachers and principals in "high vision" and "low vision" primary schools in The Netherlands. As part of a longitudinal study of innovation adoption and implementation in 116 schools, culture was assessed using a written questionnaire, and an in-depth study using interviews, observations, and analysis of written documents was completed in nine of the schools. Based on analysis of the interview data the schools were grouped in terms of their professional cultures, and further study was done of the two extreme groups; the two "high" and four "low vision" schools. Of concern was the manner in which the school's vision was communicated, and the manner of the principals' interventions supporting the communication process. Communication among teachers about goals was weak in the "low vision" schools, and teachers reported having difficulty finding colleagues willing to collaborate. In the "high vision" schools, the principal was viewed as the primary communicator: "...he permanently asks questions, he visits classrooms regularly, makes short notes, communicates clearly why a decision has been taken... there is a continuous reflection and assessment of what is going on in the school. Critical reflections are considered as a natural part of an organization looking for improvement". (p. 41) Teachers in the "high vision" schools spoke regularly of their having to justify and explain why they agree or disagree with principal initiatives or other proposals. "Conflicts are therefore not unusual ... and ... are not experienced as negative events". (p. 41) Through daily interventions these principals communicate their vision and expectations in a fashion similar to the principals studied by Blumberg and Greenfield (1980). The moral dimension of these principals' leadership is not discussed explicitly by Vandenberghe.

Marshall et al (1996) conducted a secondary analysis of an earlier study (Marshall, 1992b) of career assistant principals (CAPs) to examine the themes emerging in that study in light of perspectives reflected in work of Foster (1986), Giroux (1992), and Noddings (1984, 1986, 1992). The original study included 50 principals from rural, urban, and suburban districts in approximately half of the states in the U.S., with school sizes ranging from 500 to 1200 pupils, and the years of experience of assistants in that role ranged from 1 to 23 years. Participant

observation and interviews were the basis for data collection. Results characterize career assistants as administrators oriented to "caring and the building and nurturing of relationships", (p. 279) a perspective that reflects Nodding's ethic of caring. Marshall et al found support in the data for three themes consonant with the ethic of care: "Creating, maintaining, and enhancing connections... Recognizing and responding to contextual realities... [and] Demonstrating concern by responding to needs...". (p. 281-285) Marshall et al's "...research demonstrates that it *is* possible, albeit difficult, for caring to be intertwined in the daily work of school administrators, at least in the work of these CAPs." (p. 289) Thus, in terms of the concept of *moral leadership*, their study lends empirical support to theoretical propositions calling for critical humanist school leaders (Foster, 1986) and for building a moral community within the school (Starratt, 1991; 1996).

What Next?

To use a swimming metaphor, some of us are on the beach, watching skeptically, and others among us are at the water's edge, just getting our toes wet for the first time! A few of our friends are out a little farther, walking around in the deeper water -- and some are even swimming! Venturing into the deeper water, I see someone glance behind me back at friends on the beach -- those who won't even get near the water, much less get their feet wet -- I share her frustration as she wonders, "How will I ever be able to explain to them what it feels like to be out here?" For some in the field, I think that inquiry guided by the *moral leadership* concept must be a bit like trying to understand what it's like to swim without ever having ventured into the water. It is a concept we should continue to explore, despite the challenges of studying a phenomenon that contains within it such a complex bundle of behaviors, beliefs, values, and assumptions, including ideas regarding the transformative and moral purposes of leading in schools, and the embeddedness of those ideas in the educative and developmental context of schools as communities of learners.

We're each a product of our culture, language, and experience. There has been limited attention to *moral leadership* in educational administration, and many are still skeptical of its worth as a guide to practice, research, and theory development. The concept itself is ambiguous and does not lend itself easily to formal study. The tools of inquiry most suited for study of the *moral leadership* concept, at this stage of our understanding, are foreign to many and still are not broadly accepted within the field. Qualitative research methods in general are not well understood by many, and the complex and more sophisticated ideas associated with symbolic interactionism or critical feminist theory are not a common currency of the professoriate in educational administration. In another vein, few among us have the background or intellectual disposition for philosophical analysis, for the study of ethics, or for exploring the concerns of the critical humanist. In large measure, we study what we know how to study. This leaves a lot of unknown (or at least unmapped) territory out there to be explored, for most of us. So, where does this leave us?

One step the field can take that will facilitate more extensive, deep, and sophisticated study of the *moral leadership* concept, is to encourage those planning to enter the professoriate to prepare themselves to swim in muddy, and often turbulent, waters. Becoming grounded in the methods of philosophical analysis is not for everyone, but we need to encourage more people in this direction in our field. Not everyone is disposed to view the world from the perspective of the ethicist, the critical humanist, or the constructivist, but we should encourage more students to explore these and other non-traditional (within educational administration, as a field) regions and to pursue the ways in which leading, school organization, and other dimensions of educational administration might be understood given these vantage points.

Similarly, educational administration would serve itself well as a field to encourage more inquiry in the interpretivist and phenomenological traditions. Symbolic interactionism is a powerful and particular theoretical perspective, and among the most useful studies of *moral leadership* are those employing such approaches. This perspective lends itself well to studies aimed at understanding *meaning making* in schools, be it by school administrators or teachers. There is a tremendous gap in our school leadership and organization knowledge base -- how is it that people come to understand one another and get anything worthwhile done? We know little about about how administrators, teachers, or students make sense of their worlds. And surely their understanding of their worlds, the sense they make of their experience, is a critical guide to how they respond to the events and circumstances in which they find themselves. The perspective of the *other* is at the center of *moral* leadership. Strategies of inquiry that enable the uncovering of not only the school administrator's perspective, but the perspectives of others with whom the administrator has or wishes to develop a leadership relationship, will carry us far in helping the field understand more completely the reciprocal nature of transforming leadership. We cannot achieve such understanding with large-scale surveys -- we need research strategies that enable us to get close and go deep for a more authentic and complete understanding of what leadership means, in a phenomenological sense, to the participants in that relationship.

The studies reviewed in this essay make it clear that the personal qualities of school administrators have a big impact on what they do, how they do it, and how well they do it. These studies underscore the critical influence of culture on administrators and teachers and on leading and managing. Attention to the cultural dimensions of *moral leadership* must include the culture and sub-cultures within the school, as well as the containing community and societal culture within which the school is situated. While Lipham and Hoeh (1974), more than any others at the time, called attention to sacred and secular values and the importance of the cultural dimensions of the school and its community to the ability of a principal to lead and manage the school, few scholars in educational administration have paid much attention to those notions, either theoretically or empirically. Schein's (1985) contribution has stimulated some attention in this direction, but there still are too few studies in educational administration of dimensions of school culture and their import for school leaders and the school improvement process.

My final recommendation is one that I, and certainly others, have mentioned before. We

will do much to advance our understanding of school leadership, organization, and community by conducting descriptive field-based studies of what leadership practices by administrators and others in schools entail on a day-to-day basis. What are administrators and teachers doing? What does this "leadership dance" look like, and are the nature of the social relations among participants? What is their experience of being a teacher or administrator in a particular school? What is the meaning of that experience, in a phenomenological sense, and how are those views and perspectives revealed in this dance I'm calling leadership? We have some general hints about how administrators spend their time; about what the activities are in which they are engaged. But we know next to nothing about what all this means to them and others, or about how they and others interpret and act upon what they experience. For example, there are now quite a number of studies of transformational leadership. Most of these studies have been conducted using survey questionnaires. While such studies tell us that "vision" and other variables are important and constitutive of transformative leadership (as perceived by teachers and as operationalized in a given survey instrument), and that the principal who "leads by doing rather than simply by telling" will likely be perceived by teachers as effective, studies such as these tell us little about what the school administrator actually *does* that results in these observations?

Let us not repeat the mistakes of the past. For example, literally hundreds of studies have been guided by Halpin's (1955) concepts of initiating structure and consideration, and operationalized in the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). We learned that school administrators who scored high in both Initiating Structure and Consideration were more likely than not to be perceived as effective leaders by their school staff. This is useful and interesting information as far as it goes. But it told us very little that is useful about what it school administrators *actually do*. And without knowing what the actual day-to-day behavior looks like *in situ*, whether it be initiating structure, consideration, or *moral leadership*, how are we to really understand what such leadership actually entails (transformational leadership, for example, as operationalized by Leithwood and colleagues)? We simply cannot gain much insight from such a distance.

Burns refers to the moral quality of transforming leadership as emerging from and returning to *"the fundamental wants and needs, aspirations, and values of the followers. ...the kind of leadership that will produce social change that will satisfy followers' authentic needs"*. (Burns, 1978: 4) We need more studies of the *soft* variety; of the sort that get close to people's lives as they actually are lived. I don't think we can learn much that will be meaningful about moral leadership unless we study it up close. Surveys don't lend themselves to such inquiry. In being so distant from the focus of study they miss much that is meaningful. Like art, there is an aesthetic dimension to *moral leadership* -- leadership of this nature involves artistry as well as craft, and the enacted result, is more than the sum if its parts. We can get at some important "parts" with a survey, but this tells us little of the subtle and complex interconnections among those parts as they are enacted. One might be able to pull the right parts together, in terms of the necessary oils, brushes, and canvas, and one might even envision a image that captures the hearts, minds, and feelings of viewers. But whether the result qualifies as art entails much more than

putting paint to canvas. And this is the case, I believe, with moral leadership. To understand moral leadership requires that we gain an understanding of the perspectives, the lived experiences and the subjective meanings, of the participants in the leadership relationship. To do this requires that we study them up close. Some of the studies discussed in this essay offer examples of what such research might involve, both in terms of what to study and how to study it.

The following are six specific suggestions for extending our understanding of the *moral leadership* concept:

1. Study the *social relations* among school leaders others, focusing on the activities, interactions, and sentiments (Homans, 1950) characterizing the work of leaders in schools and the significance of these in explaining moral leadership?

2. Study the *meanings and perspectives* underlying what school leaders are *doing* in their social relations with others, seeking to understand the perspectives of leaders as well as those with whom they interact.

3. Study the nature of the *espoused purposes* of school leaders' actions and orientations toward others, and the congruence between these and their theories-in-use.

4. Study the *authenticity* of school leaders in their relations with others.

5. Study the *emotional* dimensions of *being a school leader*, including the high's and the low's of leadership, and feelings of anxiety, frustration, and anger, as well as the feelings of happiness, satisfaction, and pride, among other *passions* of leadership.

6. Study the basis of the *commitments* underlying a school leaders' purposes, social relations with others, determination to stay the course, and to remain patient in the face of the tremendous pressures school leaders are under to improve schools.

Conclusion

The past twenty years have brought a more complete human dimension to our understanding of school leadership. While there is much that remains hidden from view, the field has finally begun to explore in more concrete ways the human, ethical, and cultural dimensions of leading, school organization, and community. The studies reviewed briefly in this essay offer convincing empirical evidence of the importance of the personal and the cultural dimensions of leading in schools, and the interrelatedness of administrator's values and beliefs, language and action, and managing and leading behaviors. There obviously is much that is not understood. However, an important lesson of research guided by the *moral leadership* concept is that it *is* possible to study such phenomena empirically, and that the results of such studies *can* add meaningfully to the field's knowledge base.

In conclusion, I offer several broad recommendations. At a general level, we need to *get closer* to the participants in the moral leadership relationship. It is a subtle and complex social phenomena. That is, any leadership relationship is a socially interactive phenomenon, and cannot be studied fruitfully from a distance. We will not gain much understanding of the *moral leadership* concept by using large-scale surveys to study it. ***Getting close*** requires that we ***adopt a symbolic interactionist theoretical perspective*** in our studies of moral leadership. (Blumer, 1969). Moral leadership is a *social* phenomenon involving symbolic interaction among the participants in that relationship. Thus, to understand the meaning of *moral leadership*, in a phenomenological sense, requires that we understand how leaders and followers *construct meaning* and act on their conceptions of their worlds as subjectively experienced, understood, and interpreted (enacted) by the participants *in situ*. The context within which *moral leadership* is enacted is important to understand, as it bears directly on the leadership participants' experiences and interpretation -- the meaning they make of the world as they experience it. The study of moral leadership thus needs to attend both to the social dynamics of that relationship *and* to the context within which that relationship evolves.

References

Anderson, G. L. (1991). Cognitive politics of teachers and principals: Ideological control in an elementary school. In J. Blase (Ed.), *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation* (pp. 120-130). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Asbaugh & Kasten (1984). A typology of operant values in school administration. *Planning and Changing,* 15 (4), 195-208.

Ashbaugh, C. R. & Kasten, K. L. (1986). Administrative values and administrative action: A study of school superintendents. *Planning and Changing,* 17 (4), 195-208.

Bajunid, I. A. (1996). Preliminary explorations of indigenous perspectives of educational management: The evolving Malaysian experience. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 43 (5), 50-73.

Ball, S. J. (1987). *The micro-politics of the school: Towards a theory of organization.* London: Methuen.

Barnard, C. (1938). *The function of the executive.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Beck, L. G. & Murphy, J. (1994). *Ethics in Educational Leadership Programs: An*

Expanding Role. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Begley, P. T. (1988). *The influence of personal beliefs and values on principal' adoption and use of computers in schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Begley, P. T. (1996). Cognitive perspectives on the nature and function of values in educational administration. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P.Hallinger, & A. Hart (eds.) *International handbook of educational leadership and administration, Part 1*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. (551-558).

Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racisim*. New York: Basic Books.

Blase, J. (1988). The everyday political perspectives of teachers: Vulnerability and conservatism. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 1 (2), 125-142.

Blase, J. (1991). *The Politics of Life in Schools: Power, Conflict, and Cooperation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Blase, J. (1993) The micropolitics of effective school-based leadership: Teachers perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29 (2), 142-163.

Blase, J. (1994) *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Blase, J. (1995) *Democratic principals in action: Eight pioneers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. D. (1980). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. D. 2nd. Ed. (1986). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspectives and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bottery, M. (1992). *The ethics of educational management*. London: Cassell Educational Limited.

Brouillette, L. (1997). Revisiting an innovative high school: What happens when the principal leaves? *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 33 (Supplement), 546-575.

Bull, B. L. & McCarthy, M. M. (1995). Reflections on the knowledge base in law and ethics for educational leaders. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 31 (4), 613-631.

Burns, G. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Campbell-Evans, G. H. (1991). Nature and influence of values in principal decison-making. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 37(2), 167-178.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. 0(1986) *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge, and action research*. Philadelphia: Falmer.

Casey, K. (1993). *I answer with my life: Life histories of women teachers working for social change.* New York: Routledge.

Chui, H. S., Sharpe, F. G., & McCormick, J. (1996). Vision and leadership of principals in Hong Kong. *Journal of Educational Administration* 34 (3), 30-48.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Associates. (1988). *Charismatic leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Corson, D. (1985). Quality of judgement and deciding rightness: Ethics and educational administration. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 23 (2), 122-130.

Cusick, P. A. (1983) *The egalitarian ideal and the American high school: Studies of three schools.* New York: Longman.

Dewey, J. (1932). *Human nature and conduct.* New York: Random House.

Dillard, C. B. (1995). Leading with her life: An African American feminist (Re)interpretation of leadership for an urban high school principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 31 (4), 539-563.

Donmoyer, R., Imber, M. And Scheurich, J. J. Eds. (1995). *The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Duignan, P. A. & Macpherson, J. S. (1993). Educative leadership: A practical theory.

Educational Administration Quarterly, 29 (1), 8-33.

Duke, D. L. (1986). The aesthetics of leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22, 7-27.

Duke, D. L. (1998). The normative context of educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34 (2), 165-195.

Enomoto, E. K. (1997). Negotiating the ethics of care and justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33 (3), 351-370.

Erickson, D. A. & Reller, T. L. , Eds. (1979). *The principal in metropolitan schools*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Evers, C. W. (1985). Hodgkinson on ethics and the philosophy of administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21 (4), 27-50.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Foskett, J. M. (1967). *The normative world of the elementary school principal*. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Frankena, W. K. (1963). *Ethics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

French, J. R. & Raven, B. H. (1959). Bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics: Research and theory* (pp. 259-270). New York: Harper & Row.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Fullan, M. (1993). Moral Purpose and Change Agentry (pp.8-18). In *Change forces: probing the depths of educational reform*. London: Falmer.

Getzels, J. W. (1952). A psycho-sociological framework for the study of educational administration. *Harvard Educational Review*, 22, 235-246

Getzels, J. W. & Thelen, H. A. (1960). A Conceptual framework for the study of the classroom group as a social system. In A. Morrison and D. McIntyre (Eds.). *The*

social psychology of teaching. Middlesex, England: Penguin Education.

Getzels, J. W., Lipham, J. & Campbell, R., (1968). *Educational administration as a social process.* New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Getzels, J. W. (1979). Problem-finding and research in educational administration. In G. L. Immegart & W. L. Boyd (Eds.), *Problem-finding in educational administration: Trends in research and theory.*(pp. 5-22). Lexington, MA: D C. Heath & Co.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic government. *Educational Research*, 21 (4), 4-11.

Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory.* Mill Valley, CA; Sociology Press.

Goldman, P. & Dunlap, D. (1990). *Reform, restructuring, site-based management, and the new face of power in schools.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.

Goldman, P., Dunlap, D. M., & Conley, D. T. (1991). *Administrative facilitation and and site-based reform projects.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Goldman, P., Dunlap, D. M., & Conley, D. T. (1993). Facilitative power and nonstandardized solutions to school site restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29 (1), 69-92.

Greenfield, T. B. (1973). Organizations as social inventions: Rethinking assumptions about change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 9 (5), 551-574.

Greenfield, T. B. (1975). Theory about organizations: A new perspective and its implications for schools.. M. Hughes. (Ed.), *In Administering education: International challenges.* (pp. 71-99) London: Athlone Press of the University of London.

Greenfield, T. B. (1978). Reflection on organization theory and the truths of irreconcilable realities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 14 (2), 1-23.

Greenfield, T. B. (1979). Ideas versus data: How can the data speak for themselves? In G. L. Immegart & W. L. Boyd (Eds.), *Problem-finding in educational administration: Trends in research and theory.* (pp. 167-190) Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Co.

Greenfield, T. B. (1980). The man who comes back through the door in the wall: Discovering truth, discovering self, discovering organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16 (3), 26-59.

Greenfield, T. B. & Ribbins, P. (Eds.). 1993. *Greenfield on educational administration.* New York: Routledge.

Greenfield, W. D. (1985). The moral socialization of school administrators: Informal role learning outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 21 (4), 99-119.

Greenfield, W. D. (1986). Moral, social and technical dimensions of the principalship. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 63, 138-149.

Greenfield, W. D. (1987a). Day-to-day administrative behavior in schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 20-24, Washington, DC.

Greenfield, W. D. (1987b). Moral imagination and value leadership in schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 20-24, 1987, Washington, DC.

Greenfield, W. D. (1987c). Moral imagination and interpersonal competence: Antecedents to instructional leadership. In W. D. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, Issues, controversies.* (pp. 56-73). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Greenfield, W. D. (1987d). Moral imagination, interpersonal competence, and the work of school administrators. In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), *Leaders for America's schools.* (pp. 207-232). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Greenfield, W. D. (1991). The Micropolitics of leadership in an urban elementary school. In Blase, J. (Ed.), *The Politics of Life in Schools: Power, Conflict, and Cooperation* (pp. 161-184). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Greenfield, W. D. (1993). Rationale and methods to articulate ethics and administrator training. In C. Capper (Ed.), *Educational administration in a pluralistic society.* (pp. 267-287). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Greenfield, W. D. (1995). Toward a theory of school administration: The centrality of leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 31 (1), 61-85.

Greenfield, W. D. (1998). Values, valuing, and leadership in educational administration: A comparison across cultural contexts. Paper presented at the International Intervisitation Program, April 26 - May 2, 1998. Barbados, West Indies.

Griffiths, D. E. (1959). *Administrative theory.* New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Griffiths, D. E. (Ed.). (1964). *Behavioral science and educational administration.* National Society for the Study of Education, 63rd Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Griffiths, D. E. (1979). Another look at research on the behavior of administrators. In G. L. Immegart & W. L. Boyd, (Eds.). *Problem-finding in educational administration: Trends in theory and research.* (pp. 41-62). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Co.

Griffiths, D. E. (1979). Intellectual turmoil in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 15 (3), 43-65.

Gross, N. and Herriott, R. E. (1965). *Staff leadership in public schools: A sociological inquiry.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Gross, N., Mason, W. S., and McEachern, A. W. (1958). *Explorations in role analysis: Studies of the school superintendency role.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hallinger, P. and Leithwood, K. (1996). Culture and educational administration: A case of finding out what you don't know you don't know. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 34 (5), 98-116.

Halpin, A. W. (1955). The leader behavior and leadership ideology of educational administrators and aircraft commanders. *Harvard Educational Review,* 25, 18-32.

Harchar, R. L. And Hyle, A. E. (1996). Collaborative power: A grounded theory of administrative instructional leadership in the elementary school. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 34 (3), 15-29.

Hemphill, J. K., Griffiths, D. E., & Frederickson, N. (1962). *Administrative performance and personality.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hemphill, J. K. (1964). Personal variables and administrative styles. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.). (1964). *Behavioral science and educational administration*. National Society for the Study of Education, 63rd Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heslep, R. D. (1997). The practical value of philosophical thought for the ethical dimension of educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33 (1), 67-85.

Hill-Collins, P. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Hodgkinson, C. (1978). *Towards a philosophy of administration*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hodgkinson, C. (1983). *The philosophy of leadership*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational leadership: The moral art*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Homans, G. C. (1950. *The Human Group*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.

hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking Black*. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1992). *Black looks: Race and representation*. Boston: South End Press.

Iannaccone, L. (1964). An approach to the informal organization of the school. In D. E. Griffiths, (Ed.). *Behavioral science and educational administration*. National Society for the Study of Education, 63rd Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Immegart, G. L. and Boyd, W. L. (1979). *Problem finding in educational administration*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Inbar, D. I. (1990). The organizational boundaries of responsibility: An ethical challenge. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 28 (1), 24-37.

Kasten, K. L. & Ashbaugh, C. R. (1991). The place of values in superintendents' work. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 29 (3), 54-66.

Kelly, B. E. & Bredeson, P. V. (1991). Measures of meaning in a public and in a

parochial school: Principals as symbol managers. *Journal of Educational Administration* 29 (3), 6-22.

Kirby, P. C., Paradise, L. V., & Protti, R. (1992). Ethical reasoning of educational administrators: Structuring inquiry around the problems of practice. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 30 (4), 25-32.

Kreisberg, S. (1992). *Transforming power: Domination, empowerment, and education.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lakomski, G. (1987). Values and decision making in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 23 (3), 70-82.

Lambert, L. (1995). Toward a theory of constructivist leadership. In L. Lambert, D. Walker, D. P. Zimmerman, J. E. Cooper, M. D. Lambert, M. E. Gardner, and P. J. Ford Slack (Eds.). *The constructivist leader.* (pp. 28-51). New York: Teachers College Press.

Larson, C. L. (1997). Is the land of Oz an alien nation? A sociopolitical study of school community conflict. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 33 (3), 312-350.

Licata, J. W. (1985). The other side of the principal: Norms and beliefs. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 23 (2), 190-207.

Lipham, J. M. (1964). Leadership and administration. In D. E. Griffiths, (Ed.). *Behavioral science and educational administration.* National Society for the Study of Education, 63rd Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lipham, J. M. & Hoeh, J. A., Jr. (1974). *The principalship: Foundations and functions.* New York: Harper and Row.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider.* Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Marshall, C., Patterson, J. A., Rogers, D. L., & Steele, J. R. (1996). Caring as career: An alternative perspective for educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 32 (2), 271-294.

Marshall, C. (1992a). School administrator's values: A focus on atypicals. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 28 (3), 368-386.

Marshall, C., Patterson, J. A., Rogers, D. L., & Steele, J. R. (1992b). Caring as career: An alternative perspective for educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32 (2), 271-294.

Maxcy, S. J. (Ed.) (1991). *Educational leadership: A critical pragmatic perspective*. London: Bergin and Garvey

Maxcy, S. J. And Caldas, S. J. (1991). Moral imagination and the philosophy of school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 29 (3), 38-53.

Meskin, J. D. (1979). Women as principals: Their performance as educational administrators. In D. A. Erickson & T. L. Reller (Eds.). *The principal in metropolitan schools.* (pp. 323-347). Berkeley, CA: McCuthchan.

Miklos, E. (1983). Evolution in administrator preparation programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 19 (3), 153-177.

Miron, L. F. and Elliott, R. J. (1994). Moral leadership in a poststructural era. (Pp. 132-140). In S. J. Maxcy (ed.) *Postmodern school eadership*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Moorhead, R. And Nediger, W. (1991). The impact of values on a principal's daily activities. *Journal of Educational Administration* 29 (2):5-24.

Morris, V. C., Crowson, R. L., Porter-Gehrie, C., and Hurwitz, E. (1984). *Principals in action: The reality of managing schools*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 496-510.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Pfeffer, J. (1982). *Organizations and organization theory*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing Inc.

Pharr, S. (1988). *Homophobia: A weapon of sexism.* Chardon Press

Prawat, R. S. (1991). Conversations with self and settings: A framework for thinking about teacher empowerment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28, 737-

757.

Prestine, N. A., and McGreal, T. L. (1997). Fragile changes, sturdy lives: Implementing authentic assessment in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 33 (3), 371-400.

Reed, R. J. (1979). Education and ethnicity. In D. A. Erickson & T. L. Reller (Eds.). *The principal in metropolitan schools.* (pp. 130-155). Berkeley, CA: McCuthchan.

Reitzug, U. C. (1994). A case study of empowering principal behavior. *American Educational Research Journal,* 31 (2), 283-307.

Reitzug U. C. And Reeves, J. E. (1992). "Miss Lincoln doesn't teach here": A descriptive narrative and conceptual analysis of a principal's symbolic leadership behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 28 (2),185-219.

Riehl, C. (1998). We gather together: Work, discourse, and constitutive social action. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 34 (1), 91-125.

Ryan, J. (1996). Beyond the veil: Moral educational administration and inquiry in a postmodern world. Paper presented at the Toronto Conference on Values and Educational Leadership, October, 1996, Toronto, Canada.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Schrag, F. (1979). The principal as a moral actor. In D. A. Erickson & T. L. Reller (Eds.). *The principal in metropolitan schools.* (pp. 208-232). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Schwab, J. (1983). The practical 4: Something for curriculum professors to do. *Curriculum Inquiry,* 13, 239-265.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth dimension: The art and the practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership,* 41 (5), 4-13.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). *Value-added leadership.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective (2nd ed.). Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Shields, C. M. And Seltzer, P. A. (1997). Complexities and paradoxes of community: Toward a more useful conceptualization of community. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33 (4), 413-439.

Short, P. M., Greer, J. T., and Melvin, W. M. (1994). Creating empowered schools: Lessons in change. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32 (4), 38-52.

Simon, H. (1947). *Administrative behavior*. New York: The Free Press.

Siskin, L. S. (1997). The challenge of leadership in comprehensive high schools: School vision and departmental divisions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33 Supplement, 604-623.

Slater, R. O. (1994). Symbolic educational leadership and democracy in America. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30 (1), 97-101.

Smith, J. K. & Blase, J. (1991). From empiricism to hermeneutics: Educational leadership as a practical and moral activity. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 29 (1), 6-21.

Starratt, R. J. (1991). Building an ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27 (2), 185-202.

Starratt, R. J. (1996). *Transforming educational administration: Meaning, community, and excellence*. New York: The McGraw Hill Company.

Vandenberghe, R. (1995). Creative management of a school: A matter of vision and daily interventions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 33 (2), 31-51.

Waller, W. (1932). *The sociology of teaching*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Walton, C. C. (1988). *The moral manager*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Wayson, W. W. (1979). A view of the leadership shortage in school buildings. In D. A. Erickson and T. L. Reller, (Eds.). *The principal in metropolitan schools*. (pp. 55-77). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Willower, D. A. (1979). Some issues in research on school organization. In G. L. Immegart & W. L. Boyd, (Eds.). *Problem-finding in educational administration: Trends in theory and research*. (pp. 63-86). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Co.

Willower, D. E. (1979). Ideology and science in organization theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15 (3), 20-42.

Willower, D. J. (1981). Educational administration: Some philosophical and other considerations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 19 (2), 115-139.

Willower, D. J. (1985). Philosophy and the study of educational administration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 23 (1), 5-22.

Willower, D. J. (1987). Inquiry into educational administration: The last twenty-five years and the next. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 25 (1), 12-28.

Willower, D. J. (1994). Dewey's theory of inquiry and reflective administration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32 (1), 5-22

Wolcott, H. (1973). *The man in the principal's office: An ethnography*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Wong, K. (1998). Culture and moral leadership in education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73, 106-125.

Yukl, G. A. (1981). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.